

**IN THE DRAWINGS**

No correction to the drawings is provided. Applicant directs the Office to the amendment set forth in the specification.

### **REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action mailed on November 3, 2004.

Claims 9-29 are withdrawn; as a result, claims 1-29 remain pending in this application.

#### **§112 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 3-4 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests the Office to consider the following.

The paragraph at page 6, beginning at line 9 was amended to correct a typographical error. Item 32, the second cladding layer (disclosure at page 5, line 22 and FIGs. 6-8) has replaced the reference numeral 34, which refers to regions (disclosure at page 5, line 24 and FIGs 7-8).

Regarding the rejections, claim 3 recites “said carbon-based cladding of said second signal line is continuous with said carbon-based cladding of said first signal line.” In FIG. 7, the structures 32 and 26, particularly “the carbon-based cladding 26” (disclosure at page 5, lines 7 and 8) is continuous between the occurrences of the metallization pattern 30. Claim 4 recites “said carbon-based cladding of said second signal line is discontinuous with said carbon-based cladding of said first signal line.” In FIG. 8, the structure 32 illustrates that “all cladding material is removed from the regions 34 between adjacent signal lines ....” (disclosure at page 5, lines 24 and 25), which structure 32 is discontinuous between the occurrences of the metallization pattern 30. Because the disclosure teaches both continuous and discontinuous cladding between occurrences of the metallization pattern, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 8 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sandhu (U.S. 6,084,302). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests the Office to consider the following.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” (*Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987), M.P.E.P. §2131, 8<sup>th</sup> Ed., Rev. 1).

Claim 1 includes the limitation of “a dielectric board member”, which is congruent with the preamble in claim 1 of a “printed circuit board”. Sandhu teaches a structure on a “semiconductor substrate 5” (Sandhu at column 3, lines 1-2). Sandhu’s structure is not a board, nor is it common for one of ordinary skill in the art to refer to a “semiconductor substrate” to be synonymous with “a dielectric board member”. Further, Sandhu’s structure includes a diffusion region 3 and a transistor 2, with are not consistent with structures on “a dielectric board member” as required in claim 1. Because claim 1 calls out structure that is not taught or illustrated in Sandhu, Sandhu does not anticipate claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and are therefore also not anticipated. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-7 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 3 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 USC § 112 set forth in the Office Action.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

TERRANCE J. DISHONGH ET AL.

By their Representatives,

Date

5/26/05

By

Michael A. Bernadicou

Michael A. Bernadicou

Reg. No.: 35,934

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Teresa Mattox

Name

Signature